THE REMONSTRANCE
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1919

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, West Virginia, Texas, Florida, North Carolina, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other Publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

WHY IT WAS DONE

Some newspapers have professed to want to know why Massachusetts Anti-Suffragists were not content to abide by the vote in the Legislature for the ratification of the Federal Suffrage Amendment, and why they should have made any further contest.

The reason is simple. It was because they believed that no measure of such wide-reaching and lasting importance should be enacted until the people were given a chance to say whether they want it; still less when, within less than four years, the people, after a thorough campaign, had voted, two to one, that they did not want it. They objected to the overriding of this clear expression of the will of the voters by the hasty action of a Legislature, chosen without reference to suffrage, and badgered and bullied into such action by the combined pressure of insistent suffragists and the party whips.

The suffragists insist that there has been a great change in public sentiment, and that the State which voted so heavily against it in 1915 is now eager for it. The Anti-Suffragists do not believe this. But, if the suffragists do believe it, why should they resist every effort to test it at the polls?

If woman suffrage were once approved by a free vote of the people, the anti-suffragists would accept the result without rancor. But it is a different thing to have woman suffrage forced upon the State without the sanction of the people and over their heads.

Massachusetts Anti-Suffragists have been disappointed in their effort to get the question on the ballot at the November election. Under the Referendum to the Massachusetts Constitution, a petition for the suspension of a law and a referendum upon it must be filed within ninety days after the law was passed. But half of this time was wasted in rulings upon the technical question whether a resolution ratifying an amendment is or is not a "law"—the Secretary of State, under the direction of the then Attorney General, ruling that it was not, and that the blanks for the petition could not be printed; and later, under the advice of the present Attorney General, and the sanction of Judge Pierce of the Supreme Court, consenting to print and issue them.

Beginning thus, with the allotted time half gone, and further handicapped by knowledge of the fact that there must be a favorable decision by the full Supreme Court before the 5th of October, in order to get the question on the ballot on the 4th of November, it is not strange that the referendum petition should have fallen short of the required 15,000 certified signatures.

A MELANCHOLY MAP

The *Woman Citizen*, of September 6, published a Suffrage Ratification Map, showing, in heavy black, the States which had not ratified the Federal Suffrage Amendment, and in white, the States which had ratified it.

The most striking feature of this map, and, from the suffrage point of view, the most depressing, was the prevailing funereal hue over the Western double-suffrage States. It was assumed by the suffragists that the States which had woman suffrage through state laws would tumble over each other in their haste to spread suffrage through ratification of the Amendment. Nothing of the sort.

On the *Woman Citizen* map, they present an almost solid patch of black. There they look up blankly at the over-confident suffragists—Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Wyoming, South Dakota, Nevada, California, Colorado, Utah, Arizona and Oklahoma, eleven double-suffrage States out of a total of fifteen, refusing to be hurried into action on the Amendment. No wonder that Alice Paul was moved to say bitterly:

"The attitude of the western suffrage States, which have refused to call special sessions until ratification was assured, is being criticised and resented by women in all parts of the country."

THE PRESIDENTIAL-SUFFRAGE PERIL

It is, to a certain extent, encouraging, that some of the suffrage leaders are beginning to realize the dangerous possibilities involved in the enactment of Presidential suffrage laws in defiance of express provisions of State Constitutions limiting suffrage to male voters.

Mrs. Annie G. Porritt, Press Chairman of the Connecticut Branch of the National Woman's Party, writing in *The Suffragist* for June 7, admits that "the present condition is full of anomalies and of possibilities of political confusion" and goes on to say:

"Some time ago, opponents of suffrage called attention to these possibilities. It was pointed out that there were several states in which Presidential suffrage had been granted to women under circumstances which make possible the calling in question of the constitutionality of the law. The law cannot be decided in the courts until after it has been tested, and it cannot be tested until occasion comes for it to be put into operation. In other words, neither the friends nor the enemies of woman suffrage can tell what the decision of the court will be until after the election has been held.

"However the election of 1920 may result, it is quite certain that many people will be displeased and discontented with it. It will be open to these disgruntled politicians to try to upset the election by calling in question the right of the women to vote. It is very possible that the women voters in some of the states where they enjoy only Presidential suffrage may have it in their power to decide the vote of the state, and consequently—as in the case of California in 1916—the fate of the whole election. If, then, the laws are carried to the state supreme court, and afterwards perhaps to the Supreme Court of the United States, there would ensue uncertainty and confusion that would extend over a period of months."

Mrs. Porritt's remedy for this trouble is simple and characteristic. To avert possible complications from the votes of women under Presidential suffrage laws in states like Indiana, North Dakota, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri and Iowa, she would have the ratification of the Federal Amendment hustled along until women in all the states would be voting in 1920 under the provisions of that amendment, and Presidential suffrage laws could be disregarded. But that remedy is not so simple as Mrs. Porritt would like to think. Under existing conditions, it is extremely unlikely that the Federal Amendment can be ratified in thirty-six Legislatures in season to become operative in the Presidential election of 1920.

What then? Obviously, the only safe course is to hasten judicial decisions upon the validity of Presidential suffrage laws in the States named, or others like them. This is a course which really sincere and patriotic suffragists should be as ready to follow as anti-suffragists. Mrs. Porritt is mistaken in assuming that it must wait until the election of 1920 is past, and women have voted under Presidential suffrage laws. Cases can be brought before the courts based on preliminary proceedings, such as registration and the preparation of ballots. The question was brought up in Tennessee by the asking for an injunction to prevent the printing of forms for the registration of women voters, and the providing of separate ballot boxes. Minnesota, among others, would be a good State in which to press the issue. It will be remembered that the *Minnesota Tribune*, a journal favorable to suffrage, urged this point, in an article quoted in the July REMONSTRANCE, saying:

"It is true that the Federal Constitution provides that each State may appoint, in such manner as the Legislature shall direct, its presidential electors, but it does not provide that these electors may be appointed or elected in a manner inconsistent with any State Constitution.

The validity of this proposed law will undoubtedly be tested in the courts, for it certainly ought to be *before the results of any election are complicated by a question of the constitutionality of the law under which the election was held. If the law should be found to be unconstitutional it might very easily affect the election of the President.*"

THE BROWBEATING OF GOVERNORS

The suffragists have been devoting a large share of their energies during the last three months to trying to induce the Governors of States whose Legislatures, normally, would not assemble before 1920 or 1921, to call them in special session to act on the Federal Amendment.

Oregon is one of the States upon which the suffragists have concentrated. It is a full-suffrage State, and the suffragists felt sure of its prompt support. Normally, the Legislature will not meet until January, 1921. The suffrage leaders have brought every kind of pressure to bear upon Governor Olcott to call a special session to ratify the Amendment. But, up to the last reports, he stood firm; and refused to call a special session, unless at the request of a majority of the members of both houses and an agreement, on their part, to bear their own expenses.

Nevada is another suffrage State which has turned a deaf ear to the suffrage entreaties. Nevada is a State of huge area—nearly fourteen times as large as Massachusetts—and with a population of less than 82,000, or 5,000 less than the single Massachusetts city of Somerville. Its total vote for President in 1916 was less than 30,000. Its next Legislative session opens in January, 1921; and the Governor sees no reason why the State should spend good money in calling a special session to accommodate Mrs. Catt.

Oklahoma is another suffrage State which refuses to convene its Legislature in advance of the regular date in January, 1921; and Washington is another.

Governor Pleasant of Louisiana laid himself open to bitter suffrage attack because, so far from arranging for a special session of the Legislature—which meets normally in May, 1920—he issued an appeal to other Southern Governors not to help suffrage through a Federal Amendment. The suffragists tried to steal a march upon him in July. It happened that both the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor were absent from the State for a few days, and the suffragists tried to persuade the Acting-Governor to proclaim a special session of the Legislature while they were away, but the Governor returned promptly, and the plot fell through.

In Maryland, the suffragists drew upon President Wilson's Cabinet for aid, and Attorney-General Palmer took time from his many important official duties to send a long appeal to Governor Harrington, to which the Governor replied courteously but firmly in the negative, saying:

"I cannot see how this amendment can possibly be ratified in time for this year's election, and as our Legislature meets in full time for next year, it does not appear to me to be the right thing to call a special session, especially when the Legislature of 1918 was not elected with the question of this amendment before the people. *Besides, to my mind, it is extremely doubtful whether or not the amendment could be put through a special session this fall, as very powerful leaders of both sides, both Democrats and Republicans, are opposed to the amendment. Therefore, I do not deem it wise at this time to call an extra session, with the extra cost, when it looks like a doubtful outcome.*"

The suffragists owe a debt of gratitude to Governor Harrington, though probably they will be slow to acknowledge it, because, except for his caution, they would have had to add Maryland to Georgia and Alabama and Virginia as a State definitely rejecting the amendment.

AS TO TENNESSEE

The *Woman Citizen* exults over the decision of the Tennessee Supreme Court, rendered July 26, sustaining the constitutionality of the Presidential and municipal suffrage bill, enacted by the last Legislature. The *Woman Citizen* declares that the victory is complete, "except that the Court holds that under the Tennessee Constitution, by reason of the peculiar provisions of it, women cannot vote upon questions of lending the credit of municipalities to an outside person, firm or corporation."

This exception is more important than the *Woman Citizen* chooses to represent it, when it says that "Such a question is not likely to arise in ten years." The point is that the Supreme Court recognizes the fact that the State Constitution still exists and counts for something, and cannot be wiped out by act of Legislature or judicial decision. Such limitations as it imposes must be respected.

It happens that in Tennessee, the Constitutional provision on which the Supreme Court based its exception covered a relatively unimportant matter. But suppose that the Tennessee Constitution had contained a section like Article 7 of the Minnesota Constitution, which provides that "every male person of the age of 21 years or upwards" shall under certain conditions, be entitled to vote "for all offices that now are, or hereafter may be elective by the people" and adds that "*No person not belonging to one of the classes specified in the preceding section shall be entitled or permitted to vote at any election.*" If the Supreme Court found it necessary to respect a provision of the State Constitution relating to such a matter as the lending of municipal credit, is it thinkable that it could have overridden such a section as the above, if it had formed a part of the State Constitution? Is it thinkable that the Supreme Court of Minnesota, or North Dakota, or Indiana, or Wisconsin, or any other State whose Constitution expressly limits the suffrage to male voters could do so?

The value of the Tennessee decision lies in this: That it establishes the duty of any judicial tribunal to respect and sustain any plain provision of a State Constitution. The only thing necessary is to find the right case and the right opportunity to submit the question to the Court. And, as THE REMONSTRANCE shows in another article, it is not necessary to wait for such a decision until after an election is held, and the mischief is done. The time to act is before we find ourselves embroiled in a disputed Presidential election.

THE article on "Women Socialists," which THE REMONSTRANCE elsewhere quotes from the *Boston Transcript*, confirms the view which THE REMONSTRANCE has taken from the first, that the suffrage victory in New York was won through the Socialist vote in New York City, and that its result would be an enormous increase of Socialistic strength. It appears that it has already developed so much office-seeking activity among Socialist women that Rose Pastor Stokes is a candidate for Alderman and Emma Goldman is suggested as a some-time candidate for Mayor.

IN MEN'S JOBS

The Woman Citizen and *The Suffragist*, competing organs of the American suffragists, and *The Common Cause*, the English suffrage organ, are entirely agreed as to the duty of women who took men's jobs during the war. Their duty, they insist, is to sit tight on their jobs, no matter what happens to the returning soldiers, weary and broken, who hoped to find their places open for them. As *The Woman Citizen* elegantly expresses it: "'Come hither' said mere man to mere woman when the jobs were yawning empty. 'Back to your kennels,' snaps the master's whip when the need is over."

So far as the women who took men's work during the war and hold these views and act on them are concerned, it is plain that the praise bestowed on them for their patriotism was not merited. It was not patriotism, but self-interest, which prompted them. They took the jobs, because they wanted the pay. Now that it is suggested that they relinquish them to the returning soldiers who formerly held them, the old sex antagonism shows itself. As *The Common Cause* puts it: "The duties of women, as indicated to them by others, vary in the most surprising way from time to time. Sometimes it is their first duty to leave their homes, and at others it is a still more urgent duty to hurry back to them again. But one thing apparently is always the same, and that is, that they may not decide for themselves what it is right for them to do for their own country or their own children." And *The Woman Citizen*, in like vein, says: "Such a little while ago all male England was sobbingly grateful to the women who saved the world by the industrial aid they rendered; yet now it shakes its head at the same women who want to stay in the same industries, and says: 'It isn't done, you know, it isn't done.'"

According to *The Woman Citizen*, the investigation conducted by the New York Bureau of Women in Industry of 117 New York plants shows that 82 per cent of them express the intention of retaining their women, the main reason given being that they perform as good or better work at less pay. This was to have been expected. We are likely to see now, on a far larger scale than ever before, the effect upon men's wages of women's competition—a competition which Anti-suffragists deplore and Suffragists delight in. The woman with only herself to support is glad to work for less than the man who must support a family. and no amount of appeals from suffragist leaders will induce most women to stand out for "Equal Pay." In these critical days, as so often before, the effect of the whole suffragist movement is to make it more difficult for men to maintain homes, at the same time that it makes women more unwilling to stay in them.

But the world is slowly returning to normal conditions. When it gets back to them it will find, that in the long run, woman as woman never renders a higher service to society than in the home. The suffragists are in the habit of taunting anti-suffragists with being "the Heaven, Home and Mother" party. The anti-suffragists bear the taunt cheerfully, for the care of home and children does not seem to them an ignoble task. Except in grave emergencies, such as the war brought about, they hold that along no other lines, so far as conditions favor, can women find happier lives or render finer service to the world.

FOUR KENTUCKY SUFFRAGE LEADERS QUIT

No less than four of the most prominent woman suffrage leaders in Kentucky have withdrawn from the organization, on the ground that the Susan B. Anthony Federal Amendment is a violation of States' rights. They are Mrs. Laura Clay of Lexington, a pioneer woman suffragist, and former President of the Kentucky Equal Rights Association; Mrs. Harrison Gardner Foster, one of the two women members of the Democratic National Committee; Mrs. Will D. Oldham, President of the Fayette Equal Rights Association; and Mrs. Anthony McQuaid. This defection of leading women from the suffrage ranks, on this ground, does not augur very well for the Amendment, when it comes before the Kentucky Legislature, at its session next January.

FOR LAW AND ORDER

At a special meeting of the Executive Committee of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts called at headquarters Friday, September 12, by Mrs. Randolph Frothingham, the president, it was voted to send the following letter to Governor Coolidge:

To His Excellency,
HON. CALVIN A. COOLIDGE,
Governor of the State of Massachusetts,
Boston, Mass.

SIR:

By order of the Executive Committee of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts we have the honor to inform your Excellency that this Association is heartily in accord with your stand to maintain law and order, and offers its services in any capacity which you may consider desirable.

Very respectfully yours,
(Signed)
MRS. RANDOLPH FROTHINGHAM,
President.
MRS. FRANK FOXCROFT, *Secretary.*

GOVERNOR LARRAZOLA of New Mexico shows sound judgment in refusing to call a special session of the Legislature, at a cost of from $50,000 to $75,000, when he is sure that the Legislature would not ratify the Federal Amendment, if it were to meet. The next regular session is in January, 1921, and the Governor is not inclined to assess the taxpayers heavily to gratify the caprice of the suffragists.

NOT IN 1920

(Editorial in the *Boston Herald*, Aug. 13)

Up to date, the Legislatures of fourteen States have ratified the Federal Suffrage amendment. These States are Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Ohio, New York, Kansas, Pennsylvania. Massachusetts, Texas, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, Arkansas and Montana.

This leaves twenty-two States whose affirmative action is necessary before the amendment becomes a part of the constitution. At a hasty glance, it would seem that to have carried fourteen Legislatures within ten weeks from final action by Congress augured well for complete triumph in season to ensure the nation-wide voting of women in the Presidential election next year. But a closer examination of the situation shows that this result is extremely unlikely, if not impossible.

So recently as the 27th of July, the *New York Tribune*, a journal friendly to suffrage, announced that the ratification of the suffrage amendment was "at a standstill." The reason is that the Legislatures are not now in session; that only nine of them meet under normal conditions, next year; and that in seventeen States the Legislatures do not convene until 1921. The problem of the suffragists is to induce a sufficient number of Governors to call the Legislatures of their States in special session to act on the amendment. They are concentrating upon this campaign, but, thus far, with only indifferent success. They have been disappointed in some of the States where women are already voting under amendments to State constitutions. In California, Colorado, Arizona, Wyoming and South Dakota, special sessions have been called, or assurances have been given that they will be, but the dates have not been set. In Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Idaho and Oklahoma—all of them double suffrage States—it has been found impossible to persuade the Governors to anticipate the regular legislative sessions in 1921. This because of the expense. But, if it is hard to persuade the Governors of double-suffrage States to incur a considerable expense in order to hasten action on the amendment, it is not strange that the Governors of the eleven male-suffrage States whose Legislatures are in the 1921 class should be slow to take that action. But, unless they do, the ratification of the amendment before the Presidential election of 1920 is impossible.

To glance for a moment at the other side of the account. Rejections of the amendment by the Legislatures of thirteen States would defeat its ratification. Two States—Alabama and Georgia—have already rejected it; this, in spite of urgent personal appeals from President Wilson and members of his cabinet. These States were officially classed as "pivotal" by the suffrage leaders. In two States—Florida and Tennessee—it is impossible, by reason of provisions in the State constitutions, for the question to be brought up before the legislative session of 1921. It follows that negative action or failure to act in only nine more States would be sufficient to prevent complete ratification in season to be effective in next year's election. This, probably, explains the *Tribune's* dictum that ratification is "at a standstill."

WOMEN SOCIALISTS

(Editorial in the *Boston Transcript*, Aug. 8)

In New York City, where a great fight is on between the Right wing Socialists and the Left wing Socialists —the Left wing being the "Reds" and the Right the more conservative element whom the others designate as "Parlor Socialists"—the balance of political power in that distracted and distracting city seems to have fallen completely into the hands of the women. Women are running against women "right and left" for Socialist nominations.

For the Aldermanic nomination in the Second District, Mrs. Rose Pastor Stokes is the candidate of the Left against Mrs. Rachel Panken, wife of a municipal court judge, the Right wing nominee. In the Fourth District, Mrs. Rose Stanier is the Left's candidate against Alderman Adolph Held. For the Assembly nomination in the Twenty-first District of Manhattan the Right wing Socialists have named a colored woman, Grace Campbell by name, who is the head worker of the negro settlement house, while in the Twenty-third District the Right wingers have named Mrs. Mary McVicker. In the First District, Mrs. Anna Sloan, wife of a well-known and highly gifted artist, John Sloan, has been named for Alderman by the Right wingers. And so it goes throughout the city. Right or Left, "red" or parlor variety, women seem to have the call on assembly and aldermanic Socialistic nominations. In the Second Municipal Court District, the Socialists have even named Mrs. Fannie Horowitz as one of the candidates for the bench. It seems altogether likely that, with this enormous development of activity on the part of Socialistic women, the Socialists of New York may one day be found running for Mayor—and possibly electing—Rose Pastor Stokes or Emma Goldman.

THE REFERENDUM SITUATION IN NEW JERSEY

The New Jersey anti-suffragists are working for a referendum to the voters upon the ratification or rejection of the Federal Suffrage Amendment. Needless to say, the suffragists are fighting it. They are very much afraid of a referendum.

The two wings of the suffragists are split over the question of calling an extra session of the Legislature. The Woman's Party made a spectacular call upon Governor Runyon in Trenton, to ask for an extra session to be called to ratify. Twenty-one women with banners marched to the State House. At the same time, a telegram came to him from the President of the Suffrage Association, Mrs. E. F. Feickert, asking him *not* to call an extra session, on the ground that six seats in the Senate were vacant, and so that six counties were not represented, and that it would not be "fair" to present the amendment under such circumstances, as they desired that all parts of the State be represented when the amendment was presented. The well-known zeal of the suffragists always to be fair gives a touch of humor to this suggestion. The true inwardness of their appeal not to call an extra session was that a careful canvass of the membership had convinced them that they lacked the votes to put it through.

Of course, the Governor could not comply with both requests, and he concluded not to grant that of the women with banners. His reply was:

"Concerning the proposed ratification of the suffrage amendment, there is a wide divergence of opinion among the women themselves as to the advisability of calling a special session, and that branch of the women suffragists' associations which is numerically the strongest has advised specifically against such a session. For myself, it seems unfair to call a special session at a time when five seats in the Senate are vacant, and at least three in the Assembly, and before the electorate has had a chance to vote for candidates at an election in which the question will be an issue."

Of the four Republican candidates for Governor, one, Newton A. K. Bugbee of Trenton, has in his platform a plank calling for a referendum vote. This plank was put in at a meeting of the Republican Clubs. Of the three Democratic candidates, one, James R. Nugent of Newark, is running on a platform which urges a referendum. If either of these candidates wins at the election, the anti-suffrage appeal for a referendum is reasonably sure to be successful.

SUFFRAGE AND THE REFERENDUM

Writing in *The Woman Patriot* of July 26, Mr. Everett P. Wheeler of New York, one of the most widely-known of Constitutional authorities, expresses the opinion that in all the States which have referendum provisions in their constitutions *the referendum may be invoked to overrule any ratification attempted by the legislature.*

In support of this view, Mr. Wheeler quotes the decision of Judge Dillon of Ohio, that the framers of the Constitution intended the term "legislature" to mean "that body or bodies in which lies the full and final expression of the law of Ohio"; and the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Hildebrand *vs.* Ohio that "the legislative power of the State is now vested not only in the General Assembly, but also in the people, by referendum" and that "a law disapproved by the referendum is no law." Mr. Wheeler has, therefore, no doubt that a referendum is effective to annul legislative action upon a resolution of ratification.

Upon another point, Mr. Wheeler is quite clear. It has been maintained in some quarters that a constitutional amendment having once been submitted to the State Legislatures by Congress remains indefinitely before them even after thirteen Legislatures or more have rejected it, and may be ratified later by affirmative action in States which once rejected it. If this were true the question could be kept open indefinitely. But Mr. Wheeler holds that *"if thirteen States should refuse to ratify the proposed Suffrage Amendment and thereby reject it, the Secretary of State would be bound to issue a proclamation declaring that it had been rejected and a mandamus would lie to direct him so to do.*

That certainly seems the only rational view; and it would probably be sustained by the courts. In that case, the suffragists would have to renew their siege of Congress to secure the passage of a resolution to submit a new amendment; and they would find it uphill work.

AFRAID TO CONSULT THE PEOPLE

(Editorial in *The New York Times*, July 15, 1919)

Four years ago, the people of New Jersey decided by a majority of more than 51,000 that they did not want woman suffrage. Beaten there and elsewhere, the feminists turned their charming persuasions and their card index upon Congress. At last, the Federal amendment was squeezed through the Senate. Now its unwearied advocates think they have an easy task to cajole or threaten lukewarm State Legislatures into ratification. Have a majority of the voters of New Jersey changed their minds since 1915?

THE REFERENDUM IN MAINE

THE REMONSTRANCE is indebted to Miss Elizabeth F. McKeen, President of the Maine Association Opposed to Suffrage for Women, for the following statement regarding the referendum in Maine upon the Presidential Suffrage bill:

"The status of the Presidential Suffrage bill in Maine is, briefly, that, having been passed by both House and Senate, and signed by the Governor, the bill would have become a law by July 3, 1919—three months after the adjournment of the legislature—but for the filing of a petition signed by 10,000 voters with the Secretary of State. This petition demanded that the question be referred to the voters, and, according to Maine Constitutional law, such a petition signed by not less than 10,000 voters, obliged the Governor to submit the matter to a referendum vote, to be taken either at a special election or at the next regular election held in the State. For a special election, a period of four months must be allowed between the proclamation that such a vote is to be taken, and the day set for the voting. As the Governor has not yet made proclamation as to the time when this election is to be held, and four months from the present date would bring the election in mid-winter, it seems quite possible that the vote may not be taken until the next regular election in September, 1920. There is reason for confidence that the popular vote would be against the measure, and it is to be regretted that another popular vote against woman suffrage cannot be secured at this time, when legislatures are so lightly taking upon themselves the responsibility of doing all they can to force a sweeping suffrage extension measure such as the Federal amendment, against popular sentiment.

"The brief campaign for securing the 10,000 necessary names was arduous, as the difficulty of having such a list accurately certified and duly presented must be, inevitably; but there was no dearth of willing signers. All active workers in the campaign reported strong feeling against the measure. Nearly two thousand names more than the required ten thousand were sent in."

GLOOMY PROSPECTS FOR THE SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT

Alabama, Virginia and Georgia have rejected the Federal Suffrage Amendment by large majorities.

There are two States—Florida and Tennessee—in which the amendment cannot be acted on before the regular legislative sessions in 1921: this because of provisions in the State Constitutions which require that any proposed constitutional amendment cannot be acted on except by a Legislature elected after the amendment is submitted.

This reduces to eight the number of States necessary to hold in order to defeat the suffragist schemes to secure ratification before the election of 1920.

Of the States whose Legislatures meet, normally, in 1920, the following may pretty safely be counted on to reject the amendment:

Kentucky.
Louisiana.
Maryland.
Mississippi.
South Carolina.
New Jersey.

If this forecast is correct, it will only be necessary that two of the States whose Legislatures meet in 1921 should reject the amendment to make up the list of thirteen required to defeat its ratification. For full measure, here are four that may be looked to for this sane and sensible procedure:

Delaware.
Connecticut.
Vermont.
North Carolina.

The suffragists themselves are aware how precarious their prospects are. A few weeks ago, they were professing confidence that the amendment would be ratified in season to allow of women voting at this fall's elections; but we hear nothing of that sort now. The *New York Herald,* a suffrage paper, announced not long ago that "All the efforts of the woman suffrage leaders are directed to the pivotal States of Georgia, Alabama and Virginia." But all of these pivotal States have already declared against suffrage. The *New York Tribune,* another suffrage paper, announced in its issue of July 27 that the ratification of the suffrage amendment was "at a standstill." And we find Mrs. Catt, in a conference with New Jersey suffragists, telling them that if they could "only hold on for five years, they could rest on their laurels."

If the suffrage leader had no more cheering message than that, anti-suffragists may well feel good courage at the prospect of defeating the suffrage plans for 1920. After that election is over, and feeble political leaders have learned the futility of climbing on the suffrage band wagon, the sanity and common sense of the country may be counted on to assert themselves and the suffrage agitation may be relegated to the background.

HOW VIRGINIA FEELS ABOUT IT

The proposed Federal Suffrage Amendment did not reach a vote in the Virginia Senate at its special session; but the following stirring resolutions of rejection, adopted by the House of Delegates on the 3d of September by the overwhelming majority of 62 to 21, foreshadow an equally decisive vote in the Senate, when the question comes up at the regular session in January:

Whereas, The Congress of the United States has duly submitted to the legislatures of the several States the following proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

Article —, Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State on account of sex.

Section 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article. Therefore, be it

Resolved, by the General Assembly of the State of Virginia, the House and Senate concurring, That the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, rejected as an unwarranted, unnecessary, undemocratic and dangerous interference with the rights reserved to the States or to the people in both State and Federal Constitutions, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be filed with the Secretary of the United States as the expressed will of the people of Virginia as registered in their Constitution and by their elected representatives in the General Assembly, to retain the fundamental rights of local self-government vested in the States or in the people, and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon our sister States of the Union to uphold and defend the right of each State to decide who shall vote for its own officers, and to oppose and reject any amendment to the Constitution of the United States that would transfer control of State franchises to the Federal Congress without the consent of the people themselves as duly exercised under their several State Constitutions.

THE Maine suffragists are making a characteristic effort to forestall and nullify the referendum petitioned for on the Presidential suffrage bill by forcing through the Legislature, at the October session, the ratification of the Federal Suffrage Amendment. Stirred by this attempted evasion of the constitutional right of the people to express their wishes on suffrage, a strong Men's Anti-Suffrage Committee has printed in every newspaper in the State, and has sent to every State Senator and Representative, a demand that the people be given their rights and the sanctity of the law respected.

WOMEN AND THE PRIMARIES

(Editorial in *The Boston Herald,* Sept. 24)

The first bill to go before the Legislature should be the restoration of the convention system for the nomination of state officers. Scrap the popular primary! It has demonstrated its unfitness. It works badly enough with the present electorate. It would be considerably worse with the addition of women who give less attention than men—as shown in the school committee vote—to political concerns.

WAS IT WORTH WHILE?

Now and then, when President Wilson has leisure for reflection, he must ask himself whether it was worth while for him to interfere with the Southern Legislatures in the matter of the ratification of the Federal Suffrage Amendment. On the 12th of July he sent this telegram to the Speaker of the Alabama House of Representatives:

"I hope that you will not think that I am taking an unwarranted liberty in saying that I earnestly hope, as do all friends of the great liberal movement which it represents, that the Legislature of Alabama will ratify the suffrage amendment to the constitution of the United States. It would give added hope and courage to the friends of justice and enlightened policy everywhere and would constitute the best possible augury for the future liberal policy of every sort."

Whether the Alabama legislators did think that the President was "taking an unwarranted liberty" can only be guessed from the fact that they lost no time in rejecting the amendment. Press reporters on the spot may have been mistaken, but they agreed in representing the size of the adverse majority as a result of resentment of the President's interference.

So in Georgia: the President sent a telegram to Governor Dorsey, July 16, which was read to the Senate, while the debate on ratification was in progress. It was in these words:

"I am profoundly interested in the passage of the suffrage amendment to the constitution, and will very much value your advice as to the present status of the matter in the Georgia Legislature. I would like very much to be of help, for I believe it absolutely essential to the political future of the country that the amendment be passed. It is absolutely essential to the future of the Democratic Party that it take a leading part in this great reform."

When he appealed to the Alabama Legislature, it was "justice and enlightened policy everywhere" for which he pleaded. When he entreated Georgia, it was because ratification was "absolutely essential to the political future of the Democratic Party." But the Georgia Legislature was as deaf to the one appeal as the Alabama Legislature had been to the other, and on the 24th of July defeated ratification in the Senate by a vote of 39 to 10, and in the House by a vote of 118 to 29—or practically a four to one majority in both branches.

The President's intervention in Virginia was no more successful. In this letter he added a new argument, namely, that Virginia was his native State, and that he was therefore "profoundly interested" in the action of the legislature. But the House of Delegates turned a deaf ear to his appeal, and, on the 4th of September, by a vote of 61 to 21, refused to ratify.

"Might we not" suggest to the President that, for the sake of the cause which he seems now to have so much at heart, it would be just as well if he did not interfere?

WHO "SAVED THE DAY?"

Writing in *The Suffragist,* after the final vote in the United States Senate, Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont said, "I feel that the militants in Washington saved the day. If it had not been for what they did from the time we entered the war, the Federal amendment would have been set aside, and perhaps we would have had to wait for several years longer."

The Suffragist itself appears to think that it was Mrs. Belmont who was largely instrumental in saving the day. It says: "She has 'saved the day' herself, many times over. She has contributed more than fifty thousand dollars to the cause."

In another issue *The Suffragist* undertakes to tell "What it cost." The reader is prepared for a statement of exertions and sacrifices in behalf of the cause. Nothing of the sort. What *The Suffragist* means is that the militants spent something over $529,000 in their work.

Now it would be instructive if *The Suffragist* would tell the public frankly how this huge sum was spent.

Also, how it intends to spend the $100,000 for which it asks to carry the amendment through the Legislatures.

GOOD AUTHORITY

Democratic Governors and legislators, who refuse to trail after the suffragists in supporting the Federal Amendment, can quote a gifted historian and astute politician as an authority for their course. This is no less a person than President Wilson who, so short a time ago as January, 1917, said to the suffragists:

"I am tied to a conviction which I have had all my life, that changes of this sort ought to be brought State by State. It is a deeply matured conviction on my part, and therefore, I would be without excuse to my own constitutional principles if I lent my support to this very important movement for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

Subsequent events suggest that the President was not so securely "tied" as he imagined.

THE WORST FORM OF TYRANNY

(Editorial in the *New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin*)

In many States where, within a short time previously, a popular vote had been cast against the measure, the ratification of the so-called Nineteenth Amendment has been forced through the Legislature, often at a special session, in a way that cannot be characterized other than as the tyranny of the minority. And, of all tyrannies this form is the worst, for, while masquerading as the will of a majority, it is merely a form of autocracy in disguise. . . . The Constitution was made in the belief and confidence that an intelligent people, like those of the United States, will decide a matter right, in the long run. It also provided that this "run" should be long enough, and the decision be the result of the "sober second sense" of the people. Otherwise, it would be merely a matter of mob psychology, and that is the first and most fatal step toward anarchy.